



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

11A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,315	03/10/2004	Daniel ManHung Wong	OR03-15501	1742
51067	7590	07/13/2006		
ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION c/o PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP 2820 FIFTH STREET DAVIS, CA 95618-7759				
			EXAMINER RAAB, CHRISTOPHER J	
			ART UNIT 2192	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/800,315

Applicant(s)

WONG, DANIEL MANHUNG

Examiner

Christopher J. Raab

Art Unit

2631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/30/2006 and 09/01/2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

01. The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on **09/01/2005** and on **01/30/2006** have been considered by the examiner and made of record in the application file.

### ***Drawings***

02. The drawings were received on **03/10/2004**. These drawings are accepted.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101***

03. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

04. **Claims 8 – 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 8 – 14 claim a “computer-readable storage medium” where the specification specifically mentions examples of a “computer-readable storage medium” to include computer instruction signals embodied in a transmission medium with or without a carrier wave upon which the signals are modulated, which do not fall under statutory subject matter.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102***

05. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C.

102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office

Action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

06. **Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 10, 12 – 17, and 19 – 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

102(a) as being anticipated by ASP Alliance (Introduction to Validating User Input in Web Forms, December 29, 2003).

Consider **claim 1**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a method for using validation controls (read as query signatures to provide security for a database), comprising:

when the user's input is being processed (for example, when the form is submitted) (read as receiving the query at the database) (page 1 lines 20-21), the page framework passes the user's entry to the appropriate validation control or controls (read as parsing the query to determine a signature for the query, wherein the signature specifies a structure based on operations for the query and is independent of the value of literals in the query) (page 1 lines 21-22). The validation controls test the user's input and set a property to indicate whether the entry passed the test (read as determining if the signature is located in a signature cache, which contains signature for valid queries) (page 1 lines 22-23). And would test the state of the validation controls before updating a data record

with information entered by the user. If you detect an invalid state, you bypass the update (read as if so, processing the query) (page 1 lines 27-29).

Consider **claim 2**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a method such that if any validation checks fail (read as if the signature is not in the signature cache) (page 1 line 29), you skip all your own processing (read as the method further comprises triggering a mismatch alert) (page 1 lines 29-30).

Consider **claim 3**, and **as applied to claim 2 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a method such that validation controls that detected errors then produce an error message that appears on the page (read as the mismatch alert throws an error) (page 1 lines 30-31).

Consider **claim 5**, and **as applied to claim 2 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a method such that if any validation checks fail, you skip all your own processing and the page is returned to the user (read as the mismatch alert is sent to a requesting applications, thereby allowing the requesting application to take action) (page 1 lines 29-30).

Consider **claim 6**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a method such that when the user submits a form to the server, the validation controls are invoked to review the user's input, control by control (read as the signature cache is initialized by recording signatures of valid transactions during a system initialization operation) (page 2 lines 36-37) .

Consider **claim 7**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a method such that if any validation checks fail (read as the signatures

generates a mismatch alert) (page 1 line 19) you enable validation of user input by adding validation controls to your form as you would other server controls (read as if the query is a valid query, the method further comprises allowing a database administrator to add the signature to the signature cache) (page 1 line 16-17).

Consider **claim 8**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a computer-readable storage medium storing instructions that when executed by a computer cause the computer to perform a method for using validation controls (read as query signatures to provide security for a database), comprising:

when the user's input is being processed (for example, when the form is submitted) (read as receiving the query at the database) (page 1 lines 20-21), the page framework passes the user's entry to the appropriate validation control or controls (read as parsing the query to determine a signature for the query, wherein the signature specifies a structure based on operations for the query and is independent of the value of literals in the query) (page 1 lines 21-22). The validation controls test the user's input and set a property to indicate whether the entry passed the test (read as determining if the signature is located in a signature cache, which contains signature for valid queries) (page 1 lines 22-23). And would test the state of the validation controls before updating a data record with information entered by the user. If you detect an invalid state, you bypass the update (read as if so, processing the query) (page 1 lines 27-29).

Consider **claim 9**, and **as applied to claim 8 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a computer-readable storage medium such that if any validation checks

fail (read as if the signature is not in the signature cache) (page 1 line 29), you skip all your own processing (read as the method further comprises triggering a mismatch alert) (page 1 lines 29-30).

Consider **claim 10**, and **as applied to claim 9 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a computer-readable storage medium such that validation controls that detected errors then produce an error message that appears on the page (read as the mismatch alert throws an error) (page 1 lines 30-31).

Consider **claim 12**, and **as applied to claim 9 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a computer-readable storage medium such that if any validation checks fail, you skip all your own processing and the page is returned to the user (read as the mismatch alert is sent to a requesting applications, thereby allowing the requesting application to take action) (page 1 lines 29-30).

Consider **claim 13**, and **as applied to claim 8 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a computer-readable storage medium such that when the user submits a form to the server, the validation controls are invoked to review the user's input, control by control (read as the signature cache is initialized by recording signatures of valid transactions during a system initialization operation) (page 2 lines 36-37).

Consider **claim 14**, and **as applied to claim 8 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a computer-readable storage medium such that if any validation checks fail (read as the signatures generates a mismatch alert) (page 1 line 29) you enable validation of user input by adding validation controls to your form as you would other server controls (read as if the query is a valid query, the method

further comprises allowing a database administrator to add the signature to the signature cache) (page 1 lines 16-17).

Consider **claim 15**, ASP Alliance clearly shows an apparatus for using validation controls (read as query signatures to provide security for a database), comprising:

when the user's input is being processed (for example, when the form is submitted) (read as receiving the query at the database) (page 1 lines 20-21), the page framework passes the user's entry to the appropriate validation control or controls (read as parsing the query to determine a signature for the query, wherein the signature specifies a structure based on operations for the query and is independent of the value of literals in the query) (page 1 lines 21-22). The validation controls test the user's input and set a property to indicate whether the entry passed the test (read as determining if the signature is located in a signature cache, which contains signature for valid queries) (page 1 lines 22-23). And would test the state of the validation controls before updating a data record with information entered by the user. If you detect an invalid state, you bypass the update (read as if so, processing the query) (page 1 lines 27-29).

Consider **claim 16**, and **as applied to claim 15 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows an apparatus such that if any validation checks fail (read as if the signature is not in the signature cache) (page 1 line 29), you skip all your own processing (read as the method further comprises triggering a mismatch alert) (page 1 lines 29-30).



Consider **claim 17**, and **as applied to claim 16 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows an apparatus such that validation controls that detected errors then produce an error message that appears on the page (read as the mismatch alert throws an error) (page 1 lines 30-31).

Consider **claim 19**, and **as applied to claim 16 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows an apparatus such that if any validation checks fail, you skip all your own processing and the page is returned to the user (read as the mismatch alert is sent to a requesting applications, thereby allowing the requesting application to take action) (page 1 lines 29-30).

Consider **claim 20**, and **as applied to claim 15 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows an apparatus such that when the user submits a form to the server, the validation controls are invoked to review the user's input, control by control (read as the signature cache is initialized by recording signatures of valid transactions during a system initialization operation) (page 2 lines 36-37) .

Consider **claim 21**, and **as applied to claim 15 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows an apparatus such that if any validation checks fail (read as the signatures generates a mismatch alert) you enable validation of user input by adding validation controls to your form as you would other server controls (read as if the query is a valid query, the method further comprises allowing a database administrator to add the signature to the signature cache) (page 1, lines 29, 16-17).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

07. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

08. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

09. **Claims 4, 11, and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ASP Alliance (Introduction to Validating User Input in Web Forms, December 29, 2003) in view of The PHP Group (Error Handling and Logging Functions, November 27, 2003).

Consider **claim 4**, and **as applied to claim 1** above, ASP Alliance clearly show the claimed invention except for that a mismatch alert is sent to a database administrator.

The PHP Group clearly shows an example of using the error handling capabilities to define an error handling function, which logs the information into a file and e-mails the developer in case a critical error in logic happens (read as the

mismatch alert is sent to a database administrator and the query is processed)  
(page 7 lines 5-6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the error handling capability taught by The PHP Group into the method of using query signatures taught by ASP Alliance for the purpose of allowing an administrator to monitor errors being entered into the database.

Consider **claim 11**, and **as applied to claim 8** above, ASP Alliance clearly show the claimed invention except for that a mismatch alert is sent to a database administrator.

The PHP Group clearly shows an example of using the error handling capabilities to define an error handling function, which logs the information into a file and e-mails the developer in case a critical error in logic happens (read as the mismatch alert is sent to a database administrator and the query is processed) (page 7 lines 5-6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the error handling capability taught by The PHP Group into the use of query signatures taught by ASP Alliance for the purpose of allowing an administrator to monitor errors being entered into the database.

Consider **claim 18**, and **as applied to claim 15** above, ASP Alliance clearly show the claimed invention except for that a mismatch alert is sent to a database administrator.

The PHP Group clearly shows an example of using the error handling capabilities to define an error handling function, which logs the information into a file and e-mails the developer in case a critical error in logic happens (read as the mismatch alert is sent to a database administrator and the query is processed) (page 7 lines 5-6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the error handling capability taught by The PHP Group into the use of query signatures taught by ASP Alliance for the purpose of allowing an administrator to monitor errors being entered into the database.

### ***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a) Strong, Robert W; U.S. Patent # 6,167,523
- b) Chidlovskii, Boris; U.S. Patent # 6,347,314

11. Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Hand-delivered responses** should be brought to

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Christopher Raab whose telephone number is (571) 270-1090. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez can be reached on (571) 272-7915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Art Unit: 2631

*Christopher Raab*  
C.R./cr

June 14, 2006

  
RAFAEL PEREZ-GUTIERREZ  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
6/23/06